UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

ANNE BUCKINGHAM,	§
	§
Plaintiff,	§
	§
v.	§ CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:13-CV-392
	§
BOOZ ALLEN HAMILTON, INC.,	§
	§
Defendant.	§

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Pending before the Court in this employment discrimination suit is Plaintiff Anne Buckingham's Motion for Sanctions. (Doc. No. 41.)¹ By this motion, Plaintiff seeks sanctions under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 11 for Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 29). Because Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment does not violate Rule 11(b), Plaintiff's Motion must be **DENIED**.

I. LEGAL STANDARD

By presenting a filing to the court, litigants are certifying that, to the best of their belief after reasonable inquiry, (1) the filing is not being presented for any improper purpose; (2) the legal contentions are warranted by existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support; and (4) any denials of factual contentions are warranted on the evidence. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b). After notice and a reasonable opportunity to respond, a court may impose appropriate sanctions for violations of this prerequisite. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c)(1).

¹ All docket references are to Civil Action No. 4:13-CV-392.

II. DISCUSSION

Plaintiff asks this Court to sanction Defendant for filing a motion for summary judgment on its liability and affirmative defenses. Plaintiff's argument for sanctions is simply a belabored reiteration of the evidence she believes supports her claim and undercuts Defendant's position. Mere disagreement with Defendant's case falls far short of the showing required for Rule 11 sanctions.

For these reasons, Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED at Houston, Texas on this the sixteenth day of October, 2014.

KEITH P. ELLISON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Les P. Eleisa